



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,463	09/29/2003	Hidehiko Fujiwara	Q77726	7948
23373 7590 04/17/2009 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER SHAN, APRIL YING				
ART UNIT 2435		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/17/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/671,463	FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	APRIL Y. SHAN	2435	

All Participants:

(1) APRIL Y. SHAN.

(2) Mr. Rohit Krishna (Reg. No. 62,474).

Date of Interview: 15 April 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

/April Y Shan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2435

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the Applicant's representative to confirm he read examiner's advisory action (26 March 2009), in which the examiner advised the Applicant to check whether the method claims 1-3, 6-11 and 13-16 are qualified as a statutory process under In re Bilski by positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps or transforms underlying subject matter. The Applicant's representative confirmed he read it.